

R E M A R K S

An Office Action was mailed on December 10, 2003. Claims 1 – 13 are pending in the present application. Applicants add new claims 14 and 15. No new matter is added. Support for the new claims may be found, for example, in Applicants' specification at page 24, lines 7 – 13.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, alternatively, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,586,254). Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo in view of Carcerano et al. (U.S. Patent no. 6,308,205)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

In our Response of September 23, 2003 we applied the following arguments in regard to the cited references:

The present invention as defined by independent claims 1 and 11 relates to a method and apparatus for controlling a network including network elements interconnected by links. The claimed method comprises the steps of: a) creating view-configuration information based on network-configuration information for each of a plurality of services, such that the view-configuration information is related to the network configuration information and provides a basis for a plurality of service-specific views corresponding to each of the plurality of services; and b) displaying one or more of the service-specific view by presenting each view based on view-configuration for each of the services, each view including at least one of a physical configuration and a logical configuration of the portions of the network providing the selected service.

Kondo discloses a system for managing and operating a network interconnecting a plurality of computers and network devices (see, e.g., the abstract of Kondo). The system of Kondo includes one or more databases storing information relating to, for example, physical locations of network devices, interconnection relationships of network devices, and associated traffic information, fault information and environmental information (see, e.g., column 7, line 33 to column 8, line 39 of Kondo). The Examiner suggests that Kondo discloses or

suggests Applicants' claimed view-configuration information based on network-configuration information for each of a plurality of services. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In this and previous actions, the Examiner cites passages of Kondo's specification at column 7 line 34 – column 8 line 39, column 25 line 43 - column 26 line 65 and column 47 line 63 – column 48 line 15 and FIGS. 1c and 6a – c as supporting her position. At column 7 line 34 – column 8 line 39 of Kondo, a variety of network management means are disclosed in summary fashion, including the aforementioned databases storing information relating to, for example, physical locations of network devices, interconnection relationships of network devices, and associated traffic information, fault information and environmental information, and associated display means. Applicants are able to find no specific disclosure or suggestion in this passage pertaining to the generation and display of service-specific views of the network.

At column 25 line 43 - column 26 line 65, Kondo discloses display management means that are responsive to illustrate the effects of loss of power and other network faults on selected network elements. Again, no specific disclosure or suggestion in this passage appears to pertain to the generation and display of service-specific views of the network.

At column 47 line 63 – column 48 line 15, Kondo presents limitations of a claim to a network management system, including:

a second database for storing logical data for analyzing a network topology;

physical configuration figure creating means for creating a physical configuration figure of the network based on the data stored in the first database;

logical configuration figure creating means for creating a logical configuration figure of the network based on the data stored in the second database;

physical configuration figure checking means for determining whether the physical configuration figure satisfies a physical-numeric-condition of a network device represented by the data stored in the first database and a physical-numeric-condition of a network device indicated by a user;

logical configuration figure checking means for determining whether the logical configuration figure satisfies a logical-numeric-condition of a network device represented by the data stored in the second database and a logical-numeric-condition of a network device indicated by a user;

Again, Applicants fail to find a specific reference of suggestion relating to Applicants' claimed generation and display of service-specific views in this passage.

FIG. 1c of Kondo illustrates a database of physical information relating to network elements (for example, including information relating to site maps, buildings, floor layouts, inter-floor interconnections, and intra-floor interconnections). FIG. 6a of Kondo illustrates a method for the selection and display of sub-networks. FIG. 6b of Kondo illustrate a method for providing a plane (or two-dimensional) view of a selected network. FIG. 6c of Kondo. FIG. 6c of Kondo illustrate a method for providing a space (or three-dimensional) view of a selected network.

While Kondo does arguably define means for selecting and displaying sub-networks of a network, it fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' means for defining and maintaining information relating to service-specific views of the network. While Kondo suggests sub-networks are defined on the basis of physical interrelationships (e.g., hierarchy) and logical interrelationships, Kondo fails to disclose or suggest the views defined on a service-specific basis. This added basis disclosed by Applicants provides the advantage of introducing an additional means for more precisely discriminating portions of the network that may be of interest to a service manager. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Kondo neither anticipates nor makes obvious Applicants' claimed invention.

Carcerano discloses browser-based means for viewing and updating information about a network element on a network administration terminal (see, e.g., abstract of Carcerano). Like Kondo, Carcerano fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claimed generation and display of service-specific views.

Applicants thank Examiners Nguyen and Maung for discussing the present Office Action in greater detail by telephone interview. The Examiners suggest that Kondo explicitly teaches, or at least makes obvious, the generation and display of service-specific views (citing column 7, lines 3 – 23, column 20, lines 3 – 59, column 48, lines 16 – 22, Figs. 1c and 6a – 6c and claim 1 of Kondo). Applicants respectfully disagree.

While Kondo does teach displaying subnetworks and other topological components of a network, Kondo fails to teach or suggest generating and displaying Applicants' claimed service-specific views. In claim 1 of Kondo, for example, reference is made to "physical configuration figure creating means for creating a physical

configuration figure of the network based on the data stored in the first database” and “a logical configuration figure creating means for creating a logical configuration figure of the network based on the data stored in the second database.”

In Applicants’ claims 1 and 11, Applicants’ make reference to “service-specific views of a physical network configuration and a logical network configuration”, thereby distinguishing “service-specific views” from both physical and logical configurations. In other words, Applicants’ service-specific views can be created to show either of a physical configuration or a logical configuration (see, e.g., Applicants’ FIGs. 2 and 12a – d). The Examiners suggest that Kondo’s claimed “logical configuration figure checking means for determining whether the logical configuration figure satisfies a logical- numeric-condition of a network device” may suggest checking for service-specific conditions. Applicants note that Kondo’s claimed logical configuration figure checking means are directed to checking whether a logic configuration satisfies a condition of a device rather than checking which network components are employed to deliver a service. In addition, Applicants further note that Kondo neither discloses nor suggests examples of logical conditions that include service definitions (see, e.g., column 22, lines 16 – 22 of Kondo describing logic data “such as a log of network traffic ..., statistics of a load average of the central processing unit (CPU), a change of used amounts of a disk, a log of an outgoing packet, and the number of virtual terminals to be employed”).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 11 are not anticipated or made obvious by Kondo or Carcerano, and are therefore allowable. As claims 2 - 10 and 12 – 13 respectively depend from allowable claims 1 and 11, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 - 10 and 12 – 13 are allowable for at least this reason.

CONCLUSION

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Examiner's objections. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that claims 1 – 15, including independent claims 1 and 11 and the claims that depend therefrom, stand in condition for allowance. Passage of this case to allowance is earnestly solicited. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, he is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged on Deposit Account 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas J. Bean
Reg. No. 44,528

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN
575 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10022-2585
PHONE: (212) 940-8800/FAX: (212) 940-8776
DOCKET No.: FUJI 16.366 (100794-11274)